

**United States
Department of
Agriculture**



**Animal and
Plant Health
Inspection
Service**

Oriental Fruit Fly Cooperative Regulatory Program

Los Angeles County, California

Environmental Assessment, August 1997

Oriental Fruit Fly Cooperative Regulatory Program

Los Angeles County, California

Environmental Assessment, August 1997

Agency Contact:

Michael B. Stefan
Operations Officer
Program Support, Plant Protection and Quarantine
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
4700 River Road, Unit 134
Riverdale, MD 20737-1236
Telephone: 301-734-8247

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in its programs on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, marital or familial status, or political beliefs. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact the USDA Office of Communications at 202-720-5881 (voice) or 202-720-7808 (TDD).

To file a complaint, write the Secretary of Agriculture, USDA, Washington, DC 20250, or call 202-720-7327 (voice) or 202-720-1127 (TDD). USDA is an equal employment opportunity employer.

Mention of companies or commercial products in this report does not imply recommendation or endorsement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture over others not mentioned. USDA neither guarantees nor warrants the standard of any product mentioned. Product names are mentioned solely to report factually on available data and to provide specific information.

This publication reports research involving pesticides. All uses of pesticides must be registered by appropriate State and/or Federal agencies before they can be recommended.

CAUTION: Pesticides can be injurious to humans, domestic animals, desirable plants, and fish or other wildlife—if they are not handled or applied properly. Use all pesticides selectively and carefully. Follow recommended practices for the disposal of surplus pesticides and pesticide containers.

Table of Contents

I.	Need for the Proposal	1
II.	Alternatives	1
	A. No Action	2
	B. Quarantine Only	2
	C. Quarantine and Commodity Certification	2
III.	Environmental Effects	3
	A. Human Health	3
	B. Nontarget Species	4
	C. Environmental Quality	5
IV.	Listing of Agencies Consulted	5

I. Need for the Proposal

The oriental fruit fly, *Bactrocera dorsalis* (Hendel) (Synonym = *Dacus dorsalis* Hendel), is a destructive agricultural pest in many parts of the world, damaging a wide variety of fruits, nuts, vegetables, and berries. The oriental fruit fly, established in Hawaii since 1948, damages every commercial fruit crop grown there. Eradication programs have prevented the establishment of the oriental fruit fly in the conterminous United States, where it has been introduced a number of times since 1960. Because of the species' rapid population growth and potential for damage, a prompt response is usually desired to contain and eradicate any infestation found in the conterminous United States.

In July 1997, the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) and the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) detected oriental fruit flies in the Covina area of Los Angeles County, California. That infestation represents a major threat to the agriculture and environment of California and other U.S. mainland States. APHIS is proposing to cooperate with CDFA in a regulatory program to prevent the spread of oriental fruit fly to noninfested areas of the conterminous United States. APHIS' authority for cooperation in the program is based upon the Organic Act (7 United States Code (U.S.C.) 147a), which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out operations to eradicate insect pests, and the Federal Plant Pest Act (7 U.S.C.150dd), which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to use emergency measures to prevent the dissemination of plant pests new to or not widely distributed throughout the United States.

This site-specific environmental assessment analyzes alternatives for regulatory control of the oriental fruit fly and incorporates by reference the analyses, discussions, and conclusions of two earlier documents, APHIS' programmatic environmental assessment (programmatic EA) entitled "Oriental Fruit Fly Regulatory Program, Environmental Assessment, November 1991" and the "Human Health Risk Assessment, APHIS Fruit Fly Programs" (human health risk assessment). This environmental assessment considers the previously identified alternatives of no action, quarantine only, and quarantine and commodity certification (preferred alternative). Control methods proposed as components of the preferred alternative include (1) no action, (2) quarantine, (3) regulatory chemicals (fumigation, soil treatment, and bait spray application), (4) cold treatment, and (5) vapor heat treatment.

II. Alternatives

APHIS, in its programmatic EA, originally identified three alternatives. They are (1) no action, (2) quarantine only, and (3) quarantine and commodity certification. Each of those alternatives is described concisely below (and in greater detail in the programmatic EA). Our review of this proposed program and of the technologies currently available to APHIS for an emergency program of this nature has confirmed that there are no changes in or additions to those control methods originally analyzed.

A. No Action

The no action alternative would involve no Federal regulatory effort to restrict the spread of the oriental fruit fly or facilitate (certify) the commercial movement of oriental fruit fly host materials and other regulated articles. In the absence of a Federal effort, quarantine and control would be left to the State government, grower groups, and individuals. The infestation's expansion would be limited by any controls exerted over it, by the proximity of host plants, and by climatic conditions. Expansion of the infestation would result in substantial economic losses to growers in the United States and losses of U.S. export markets.

B. Quarantine Only

Under the quarantine only alternative, commodities harvested within the quarantine area would be restricted to movement within that area. In the absence of regulatory controls, this would result in a reduction of the movement of oriental fruit flies to outside of the quarantined area, but would result in an infestation remaining established within the quarantine boundaries. (Oriental fruit fly eradication efforts are managed by and are wholly under the control of CDFA.) A Federal quarantine requires that commodities harvested within the quarantine boundaries be destroyed or sold within the local retail market within the quarantined area. In large infestations, intensive quarantine enforcement activities may be necessary, including safeguarding of local fruit stands, mandatory baggage inspection at airports, and judicious use of road patrols and roadblocks.

C. Quarantine and Commodity Certification

The alternative couples the Federal quarantine previously described with commodity treatment and certification. The same quarantine (described above) would be imposed, but commodity certification (with prescribed treatments) would further reduce the risk of moving oriental fruit flies to outside the quarantine area and complement the State's efforts to eradicate the infestation. APHIS' Plant Protection and Quarantine commodity certification regulations set requirements for the movement of regulated produce harvested within the quarantined boundaries to outside locations. Interstate movement of that produce requires the issuance of a certificate or limited permit, contingent upon the grower or shipper complying with specific conditions designed to minimize pest risk and prevent the spread of the oriental fruit fly.

Control methods that may be used in this alternative include (1) no action, (2) quarantine, (3) regulatory chemicals (fumigation, soil treatment, and bait spray application), (4) cold treatment, and (5) vapor heat treatment. No action could be used in a limited sense where regulatory efforts would not be allowed under a State or local law, or could be used temporarily until such a legal constraint could be resolved. The quarantine component is essentially the same as the alternative described in section B above. Regulatory chemical treatments would include fumigation with methyl bromide, soil treatment with diazinon, and topical bait spray with a mixture of malathion and a protein hydrolysate bait. (Refer to the programmatic EA for more detailed information about the

chemicals and their uses.) Cold treatment of produce, as a requirement for certification and shipping, may be done in facilities that are inspected and approved by APHIS. Vapor heat treatment is also used for treatment of produce, prior to movement, in facilities that are approved by APHIS.

III. Environmental Effects

The potential environmental consequences of each of the alternatives (no action, quarantine only, and quarantine and commodity certification) were considered. The proposed program—quarantine and commodity certification—would be an integrated pest management (IPM) approach that would use any or a combination of the following control methods: (1) no action, (2) quarantine, (3) regulatory chemicals (fumigation, soil treatment, and bait spray application), (4) cold treatment, and (5) vapor heat treatment. Each of these has been analyzed and discussed in detail within the programmatic EA and the human health risk assessment. Refer to those documents for more detailed information.

For this specific program, the following issues were identified and analyzed: (1) potential effects on human health from chemical pesticide applications, (2) potential effects on wildlife (including endangered and threatened species) from program activities and treatments, and (3) potential effects on environmental quality. The site-specific characteristics of the program area were considered with respect to their potential to alter or influence the anticipated effects on human health, wildlife, or environmental quality.

The proposed program's area has urban, suburban, and rural characteristics. The pest detections are near heavily populated residential areas, but also near commercial groves. There are a number of sensitive sites in or near the proposed quarantine area. The presence of some bodies of water requires careful management and the use of site-specific buffers to avoid drift and minimize contamination of those water bodies. Standard program operational procedures and mitigative measures will be employed to avoid adverse impacts to these areas.

A. Human Health

The principal concerns for human health are related to the program use of chemical pesticides: malathion bait, diazinon (a soil drench), and methyl bromide (a fumigant). Three major factors influence the human health risk associated with pesticide use: fate of the pesticides in the environment, their toxicity to humans, and their exposure to humans. Each of the program pesticides is known to be toxic to humans. Exposure to program pesticides can vary, depending upon the pesticide and the use pattern, but the analyses and data of the programmatic EA and human health risk assessment indicate that exposures to pesticides from normal program operations are not likely to result in substantial adverse human health effects. Refer to the programmatic EA, the human health risk assessment, and their supporting documents for more detailed information relative to human health risk.

The alternatives were compared with respect to their potential to affect human health. In general, a well-coordinated regulatory program using IPM technologies in quarantine and

commodity certification would result in the least use of chemical pesticides overall and the least potential to adversely affect human health. The no action alternative and the quarantine only alternative would be expected to result in broader and more widespread use of pesticides by homeowners and commercial growers, with correspondingly greater potential for adverse impact.

Consistent with Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations," APHIS considered the potential for disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations. In general, the population of this area is diverse and lacks any special characteristics that differ from those described in the EA. Some areas within Los Angeles County, however, have large minority populations. In particular, a large Hispanic population there requires that public documents and notifications be provided in Spanish. APHIS also recognizes that a proportion of the population may have unusual sensitivity to certain chemicals or environmental pollutants and that program treatments pose higher dangers for these individuals. Special notification procedures and precautions, as stated in the programmatic EA's general mitigative measures, are required and serve to minimize the risk for this group.

B. Nontarget Species

The principal concerns for nontarget species (including endangered and threatened species) also involve the use of program pesticides. Paralleling human health risk, the risk to nontarget species is related to the fate of the pesticides in the environment, their toxicity to the nontarget species, and their exposure to nontarget species. All of the pesticides are highly toxic to invertebrates, although the likelihood of exposure (and thus impact) varies a great deal from pesticide to pesticide, and with the use pattern. In general, a well-coordinated quarantine and certification program using IPM technologies would result in the least use of chemical pesticides overall with minimal adverse impact to nontarget species. The no action alternative and the quarantine only alternative would be expected to result in broader and more widespread use of pesticides by homeowners and commercial growers, with correspondingly greater potential for adverse impact. Refer to the programmatic EA and its nontarget risk assessment for more information on risks to all classes of nontarget species.

The area was considered with respect to any special characteristics that would tend to influence the effects of program operations. Potentially sensitive areas have been identified, considered, and accommodated through special selection of control methods and use of specific mitigative measures. The area contained no special characteristics that would require a departure from the standard operating procedures and mitigative measures that were described in the programmatic EA.

APHIS is consulting with the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), under the provisions of section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973. APHIS will implement protective measures mutually agreed upon with FWS for the protection of endangered and threatened species, and their critical habitats.

C. Environmental Quality

The environmental quality issues include concerns for the preservation of clean air, pure water, and a pollution-free environment. The principal concern of this assessment is the potential consequence of program use of pesticides. Although program pesticide use is limited, especially in comparison to other agricultural pesticide use, the proposed action would result in a controlled release of chemicals into the environment. The fate of those chemicals varies with respect to the environmental component (air, water, or other substrate) and its characteristics (temperature, pH, dilution, etc.). The half-life of malathion in soil or on foliage ranges from 1 to 6 days; in water, from 6 to 18 days. The half-life of diazinon in soil ranges from 1.5 to 10 weeks; in water at neutral pH, from 8 to 9 days. Methyl bromide's half-life is 3 to 7 days, but the small quantities used disperse when fumigation chambers are vented. Refer to the programmatic EA for a more detailed consideration of the pesticides' environmental fates.

The alternatives were compared with respect to their potential to affect environmental quality. Again, a well-coordinated quarantine and certification program using IPM technologies would result in the least use of chemical pesticides overall with minimal adverse impact on environmental quality. The no action alternative and the quarantine only alternative would be expected to result in broader and more widespread use of pesticides by homeowners and commercial growers, with correspondingly greater potential for adverse impact.

The proposed program area was examined to identify characteristics that would tend to influence the effects of program operations. Allowances were made for the special site-specific characteristics that would require a departure from the standard operating procedures. The approaches used to mitigate for adverse impacts to bodies of water are described in the EA.

IV. Listing of Agencies Consulted

Program Support
Plant Protection and Quarantine
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
4700 River Road, Unit 134
Riverdale, MD 20737-1236

California Department of Food and Agriculture
1220 N Street
P.O. Box 942871
Sacramento, CA 94271-0001

**Finding of No Significant Impact
for
Oriental Fruit Fly Cooperative Regulatory Program,
Los Angeles County, California,
Environmental Assessment, August 1997**

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) that analyzes alternatives for regulatory control of the oriental fruit fly, an exotic agricultural pest that has been found in the Covina area of Los Angeles County, California. The EA, incorporated by reference in this document, is available from:

USDA, APHIS, PPQ
Western Regional Office
9580 Micron Avenue, Suite I
Sacramento, CA 95827


or

USDA, APHIS, PPQ
Program Support
4700 River Road, Unit 134
Riverdale, MD 20737-1236

The EA for this program analyzed alternatives of (1) no action, (2) quarantine only, and (3) quarantine and regulatory certification. Each of those alternatives was determined to have potential environmental consequences. APHIS selected quarantine and regulatory certification, using an integrated pest management approach for the proposed program because of its capability to achieve program regulatory objectives (reduction of pest risk and spread) in a way that also reduces the magnitude of the potential environmental consequences.

APHIS is consulting locally with the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), with regard to the protection of endangered and threatened species or their critical habitats. APHIS will adhere to protective measures designed specifically for this program and mutually agreed upon with FWS.

I find that implementation of the proposed program will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. I have considered and based my finding of no significant impact on the quantitative and qualitative risk assessments of the proposed pesticides and on my review of the program's operational characteristics. In addition, I find that the environmental process undertaken for this program is entirely consistent with the principles of "environmental justice," as expressed in Executive Order No. 12898. Lastly, because I have not found evidence of significant environmental impact associated with this proposed program, I further find that an environmental impact statement does not need to be prepared and that the program may proceed.


James R. Reynolds
Regional Director, Western Regional Office
Plant Protection and Quarantine
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

August 5, 1997
Date